



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/637,531	04/25/96	RHOADS	4830-44937/W

22M2/0923  
KLARQUIST SPARKMAN CAMPBELL LEIGH  
& WHINSTON  
ONE WORLD TRADE CENTER  
121 SOUTHWEST SALMON STREET SUITE 1600  
PORTLAND OR 97204

EXAMINER

CANGIALOSI, S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2202

15

DATE MAILED: 09/23/97

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

637,531

Applicant(s)

Rhoades

Examiner

S. Cangialosi

Group Art Unit

2202

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

## Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

## Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/14/97
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 21-70 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 21-70 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- ☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
  - ☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Office Action Summary

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide clear support for the claim terminology. 37 CFR § 1.75(d)(1) requires that terms and phrases used in the claims find clear support or antecedent basis in the description so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable by reference to the description. Specifically, the term photographic emulsion paper, printing kiosk and most other claim limitations do not appear in the specification.

2. The following is a quotation of 37 CFR 1.71(a)-(c):

(a) The specification must include a written description of the invention or discovery and of the manner and process of making and using the same, and is required to be in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art or science to which the invention or discovery appertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same.

(b) The specification must set forth the precise invention for which a patent is solicited, in such manner as to distinguish it from other inventions and from what is old. It must describe completely a specific embodiment of the process, machine, manufacture, composition of matter or improvement invented, and must explain the mode of operation or principle whenever applicable. The best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention must be set forth.

(c) In the case of an improvement, the specification must particularly point out the part or parts of the process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter to which the improvement relates, and the description should be confined to the specific improvement and to such parts as necessarily cooperate with it or as may be necessary to a complete understanding or description of it.

The specification is objected to under 37 CFR 1.71 because  
**no description of the claimed invention is found in the  
specification.**

3. Claims 21-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

The convoluted chain of parent cases does not now show how an invention and disclosure for a cellular telephone transforms by preliminary amendment more than a year after filing into a photographic emulsion paper. The applicant is requested, if he persists in the instant case, to provide corroborating evidence

including copies of the prior cases where the basis for the current invention resides. The specification final form is the choice of the applicant providing no new matter is added. But it is not seen how, since original presentation of the specification there is any enabling support for the claimed invention.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 21-~~70~~ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over commercially available photographic paper.

The Kodak company for many years watermarked its photographic papers used in the printing of the majority of developed photos in the United States substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention are that there is no mention of a specific ancillary information. It is noted that the watermark is obviously ancillary information. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Kodak paper because it is conventional and standard practice to employ brand watermarks and these components are no more than the conventional equivalents of what is disclosed in the primary items of evidence. The deficiencies of the art with respect to the

Serial Number: 08/637,531  
Art Unit: 22202

-4-

dependent claims if any deal with the conventional photographic processes.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Salvatore Cangialosi whose telephone number is (703) 308-1837.

*Salvatore Cangialosi*  
SALVATORE CANGIALOSI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 222

sac

September 18, 1997